

REMARKS

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed remarks and analysis. Claims 1-21 remain pending, with claims 4, 5, 7, 9-12 and 17-21 withdrawn. Claims 2, 3 and 8 were rejected as not complying with 35 U.S.C. §112. The claims have been amended to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8 and 13-16 were rejected as being anticipated by Salvagnini (U.S. 4, 843,862). Applicant disagrees that Salvagnini discloses the features recited in claims 1 and 13.

Claim 1 requires a failsafe device for moving a rotary cam to a bending position when a first actuator fails to move the rotary cam to the bending position. The failsafe device includes a rotatable element supported between first and second arms, and a second actuator applying force directly to the rotatable element for moving the rotary cam to the bending position.

The disclosed Salvagnini device does not disclose any such feature. Salvagnini discloses actuators 10, 20 and 15 that all move bending blades 2 and 3 in different directions. None of the cylinders provides for movement of a rotary cam in the event of failure of another actuator. Accordingly, claim 1 cannot be anticipated by Salvagnini.

Claim 13 requires a second actuator for moving the rotary cam toward the bending positions for ensuring the rotary cam moves to the bending position regardless of a condition of the first actuator. Each of the Salvagnini cylinders 10,20, and 15 move the bending blades 2 and 3 in a different directions and as such none of the cylinders are capable of moving the blades 2 and 3 into a bending position in the absence of or upon the failure of any of the other cylinders. Accordingly, claims 1 and 13 recited feature that cannot be anticipated by Salvagnini.

Further, claim 2 requires that the second actuator include a cam surface engageable with a rotatable element. The office action reads wedge 23 as the cam surface. However, the wedge does not engage any rotatable element and therefore cannot anticipate claim 2.

Claim 6 requires that the rotatable element include a roller supported on a shaft. This is not disclosed or suggested by Salvagnini. The office action reads shaft 19 that supports arms 18 as the claimed shaft, however no roller as is required is disclosed. For this reason, Salvagnini cannot anticipate claim 6.

Claim 8 depends from claim 6 and requires that the rotatable element include a block with a heel surface. Salvagnini does not disclose any such feature or structure. The office action

simply cites to Figure 1, but does not identify any feature that meets this limitation. Salvagnini does not disclose this feature.

Claim 14 requires first and second arms attached for rotation with the cam and a rotatable element supported between the first and second arms. The office action reads the cam as element 9, and the rotatable element as 17. Element 9 is a shaft, not a rotary cam and element 12 is a torsion bar. These elements cannot meet the claimed limitations.

Claim 15 requires that the second actuator apply a biasing force directly to the rotatable element, and claim 16 requires a pivot pin that supports the rotatable element between the first and second arms. These features are not disclosed or suggested.

For the reasons discussed above, the claims are believed in condition for allowance. No additional fees are seen to be required. If any additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482, in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, P.C., for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully Submitted,

CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.

/John M. Siragusa/

John M. Siragusa
Registration No. 46,174
400 West Maple Road, Suite 350
Birmingham, Michigan 48009
Telephone: (248) 988-8360
Facsimile: (248) 988-8363

Dated: May 8, 2007